



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

times the cryptic words, *sic vos non vobis*, each phrase apparently the beginning of an unfinished line. Now to abandon this feature in a translation is to miss the whole point of the challenge to Bathyllus, a point which is just as much a part of the original Latin as the words are. The challenge to Bathyllus was: Do you take chalk and, leaving Vergil's words *just as they are*, complete the lines. So in an English translation each line of the quatrain must begin: "So you not for yourselves," and the translation of the remainder of each Latin line, as supplied by Vergil, must be completed in that same line. Such a translation will not be as pretty and flowing as that which we are criticizing, but it will at least be true to Vergil's words and to the dramatic situation from which they sprang. We submit the following lines as an attempt to reproduce in their simplicity and purpose the lines of Vergil.

I wrote these lines, another has gained the praise.
 So you not for yourselves draw plows, ye kine;
 So you not for yourselves make honey, bees;
 So you not for yourselves bear fleeces, sheep;
 So you not for yourselves build nests, O birds.

F. J. MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

FINSLER AND THE TELEMACHY

In his *Homer* (1914), p. 431, at the end of a remarkably clear and judicial summary of the higher criticism of Homer, Professor G. Finsler states briefly his own view of the composition of the *Odyssey*. Since this is one of the most recent formulations of the theory of a "Telemachy," and since it is made by a scholar of distinction who is thoroughly familiar with Homer and with the history of Homeric scholarship, it is worthy of serious attention. The *Odyssey*, writes Professor Finsler, contains a number of mythical or fabulous parts, i.e., Books V–XII and certain scenes in the second half of the poem, which are in sharp contrast with the surrounding portions. . . . If these elements are removed there remains a poem which is complete with almost no gap in it. This poem we may call the Telemachy. . . . The action of the Telemachy lacks entirely the mythical or fabulous element. . . . Into the fabric of this complete (*geschlossen*) poem the poet of our *Odyssey* wove the mythical and fabulous features. . . . He created the *Odyssey* as we have it, and in doing so, lifted the subject-matter once more into the realm of the mythical or fabulous, which the Telemachy had avoided.

Let us see how this theory squares with the facts. The kernel of the story of Telemachus in the *Odyssey* is the journey to Sparta. One can hardly believe that in an earlier "Telemachy" Menelaus gave Telemachus no tidings of his father; so far as I know the critics have offered no evidence that he did not. But the sources of the Spartan king's information about Odysseus

was Proteus, one of the most mythical and fabulous characters in the *Odyssey*. From whom, if not from the old sea-god, could Menelaus have learned that Odysseus was detained on a sea-girt isle? The critics² are silent; they merely assert that the story of Menelaus (which is so much in the style of the story which Odysseus tells to Alcinous!) was taken bodily from one of the *Nostoi*, and inserted in the "Telemachy." Yet unless Wilamowitz, Seeck, and Finsler will explain how and why, with respect to what happened at Sparta, the "Telemachy" differed from the story of Telemachus as Homer tells it, and unless they offer convincing evidence for the difference, it is not easy to see how one can accept the hypothesis of a "Telemachy" as a complete poem whose action "entfehrt durchaus des mythischen oder märchenhaften Characters." The more natural conclusion is that the hypothetical "Telemachy" itself belongs to the realm of the fabulous and mythical, and not to sound Homeric criticism. Of course someone must have invented the story of Telemachus—or at least have put the story into poetic form—but why not give the credit for this to the great poet himself?

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

² Professor Finsler promises to give his theory in full in the second volume of his work, but with regard to the "Telemachy" he, like Seeck, follows Wilamowitz.